

REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action mailed on December 14, 2007. Claims 1-3, 10, 13, 18, 22-23, 25-26 and 28 are amended; claims 1-32 remain pending in this application. The amendment to claim 1 is supported at least by FIG. 4 and the portions of the specification that discuss that figure. Claims 2-5 were amended to correct grammar in light of the amendment to claim 1. Claims 10 and 18 are supported at least by FIG. 7 and the portions of the specification that discuss that figure. Claim 13 has been amended for clarity. Claims 22-23, 25 and 27-32 have been amended to correct for grammar in light of the amendment to claim 18. The amendment to claim 26 is supported at least by FIG. 7 and the portions of the specification that discuss that figure and by the specification at page 12, lines 8-20.

Applicant respectfully requests further examination and reconsideration of this application in view of these amendments and the following remarks.

§112 Rejection of the Claims

Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for indefiniteness. Claim 13 has been amended for clarity. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claim are respectfully requested.

§102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-6, 8, 9, and 18, 20, 21, and 23-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for anticipation by Luetgert et al. (US 2002/0048660 A1), hereinafter "Luetgert".

Claim 1 and its Dependent Claims

Claim 1 has been amended. Applicant has searched Luetgert and is unable to find reference to an insulation core substantially adjacent the first fiberboard substrate along a first interior face opposite the first exterior face of the first fiberboard substrate, the insulation core having a first side surface area corresponding to the first exterior face, a second fiberboard substrate having a second exterior face and a second interior face, with the insulation core adjacent the second fiberboard such that the insulation core is disposed between the first fiberboard substrate and the second fiberboard substrate with a second side of the insulation core,

opposite the first side, having a second side surface area corresponding with the second interior face, the second fiberboard substrate including wood fiber and a waterproof resin and a bracket coupling the first fiberboard substrate and the second fiberboard substrate, as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant believes claim 1 to be patentable over Luetgert.

Claims 2-6, 8 and 9 ultimately depend on claim 1 and are believed to be allowable at least for the reasons provided with respect to that claim. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 1-6, 8 and 9 are respectfully requested.

Claim 18 and its Dependent Claims

Claim 18 has been amended. Applicant has searched Luetgert and is unable to find reference to aligning an insulation core between the first and second fiberboard substrates such that a first side of the insulation core corresponds with a face of the first fiberboard substrate and a second side of the insulation core opposite the first side corresponds with a face of the second fiberboard substrate and retaining the first and second fiberboard substrates and the insulation core together with a bracket, as recited in claim 18. Accordingly, Applicant believes claim 1 to be patentable over Luetgert.

Claims 20, 21, and 23-24 ultimately depend on claim 1 and are believed to be allowable at least for the reasons provided with respect to that claim. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 18, 20, 21, and 23-24 are respectfully requested.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 7 and 19

Claims 7 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Luetgert in view of Rayner (US 2,932,596), hereinafter Rayner. These claims depend on claims that have been amended. Accordingly, these claims are believed to be allowable at least for the reasons set out above with respect to the base claims. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 7 and 19 are respectfully requested.

Claim 22

Claim 22 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Luetgert. This claim depends on a claim that has been amended. Accordingly, this claim is believed to be allowable at least for the reasons set out above with respect to its base claim. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claim are respectfully requested.

Claims 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17, 26, 27, 30, and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Turner (US 4,702,054) in view of Luetgert and Hollman (US 6,487,827 B2).

Claim 10 and its Dependent Claims

In addition to these three references failing to set out all the elements claimed, they additionally teach away from the claimed subject matter. Turner is directed toward a single core configuration.¹ The present subject matter provides multiple cores, which at least improves configurability, but also decreases the influence of tolerance stack-up. This is important in harsh thermal and barometric environments, which the subject matter is well suited for. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the subject matter of claim 10 is allowable. Claims 11-17 ultimately depend on claim 10 and are believed to be allowable at least for the reasons provided for that claim. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claim are respectfully requested.

Claim 26 and its Dependent Claims

Claim 26 has been amended. Applicant has searched Turner, Luetgert and Hollman and is unable to find reference to a first and second panel or to a first and second insulation core, as referenced in claim 26. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 26 is allowable. Claims 27, 30 and 32 ultimately depend on claim 26 and are believed to be allowable at least for the reasons provided for that claim. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 26-27, 30 and 32 are respectfully requested.

¹ See Turner, Abstract.

Claims 12, 28, and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Turner, Luetgert, and Hollman as applied to claims 10-11 above, and in further view of Bawa et al. (US 4,930,276), hereinafter Bawa.

Claim 12

This claim depends on a claim that is believed to be allowable. Accordingly, claim 12 is believed to be allowable at least for the reasons set out above with respect to its base claim. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claim are respectfully requested.

Claim 28

Claim 28 depends on claim 26, which has been amended. Insofar as the rejection applies to the amended claims, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Applicant has searched Turner, Luetgert, Hollman and Bawa and is unable to find, among other things, reference to a plurality of insulation cores within respective panel cavities, as recited in claim 28. Further, Applicant respectfully asserts that it would not be obvious for one of skill in the art to look to Bawa, as Bawa does not remedy the problems solved by the subject matter of claim 28 as amended.

The claimed door assembly benefits from increased water resistance due to the application of a sealant between a panel and door. The panel includes wood and veneer. Applicant respectfully submits that it is a different problem to seal such a panel than it is to seal glass, as referenced in Bawa. The glass of Bawa has different expansion properties than a wood panel in the company of harsh thermal and barometric conditions. The glass of Bawa does not flex as does the panel of claim 26. As such, Bawa does not address the needs of sealing multiple panels to multiple cavities. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the subject matter of claim 28 is allowable and requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claim.

Claim 29

This claim depends on a claim that is believed to be allowable. Accordingly, claim 29 is believed to be allowable at least for the reasons set out above with respect to its base claim. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claim are respectfully requested.

Claims 16 and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Turner, Luetgert, and Hollman as applied to claim 10 above, and in further view of Twigg et al. (US 6,151,849). These claims are dependent on base claims that are believed to be allowable for reasons set for above. Therefore it is respectfully requested that for at least those reasons the rejection of claims 16 and 31 be withdrawn and that they be allowed.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney at (612) 359-3276 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(612) 359-3276

Date

May 12, 2008

By

Catherine I. Klima-Silberg
Reg. No. 40,052

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 12 day of May 2008.

~~CANDIS BUENDING~~

Name

John D. Gault-Woodhall

Signature

John D. Gault-Woodhall